

our great country and our people as anti-Muslim, anti-Arab. It is this type of language that they use to recruit others to be car bombers; suicide attackers; hostage takers, and full-fledged jihadists.

It is darkly ironic that those who want to close Guantanamo for the sake of public diplomacy are themselves wreaking great damage to our public diplomacy by floating outlandish and slanderous allegations.

It has to stop. We can, and should, have serious debates about legitimate policy questions. But comparing our Nation, our Government and our military to the regimes of Hitler's Germany, Stalin's Soviet Russia, and Pol Pot's Cambodia is the height of irresponsibility.

Frankly, I think it demands an apology to our service men and women, and to all others in our Government who are working hard every day to stop the terrorists, prevent attacks on our homeland, and to win the war on terrorism.

We are fighting a war. And young men and women are out in the field, risking their lives. For their sake, the toxic rhetoric must stop.

#### CMA FESTIVAL

Mr. FRIST. Madam President. Nashville, TN is home to some of the best music in the world. Last weekend, I had the pleasure of being back home during the 2005 Country Music Association Festival—"Country Music's Biggest Party."

More than 130,000 country music lovers from around the world come to hear their favorite stars perform for the 4-day extravaganza. The energy is electric.

From legendary artists like Kenny Rogers and Dolly Parton, to new talents like Sarah Evans, Rascal Flatts, and Gretchen Wilson, more than 400 country music stars perform over 70 hours of music.

Not only are fans treated to the best country music has to offer, they get to meet their favorite stars up close and personal at the Fan Fair Exhibit Hall where performers sign autographs and mingle with the crowd.

This year, fans were treated to the first ever Music Festival Kick-Off parade in downtown, and a spectacular fireworks display, Sunday night, at the Coliseum. In just 4 days, the festival generates more than \$20 million for the local economy.

The CMA Festival has become a Nashville institution, joining the Grand Ole Opry and the Ryman Auditorium as symbols of our rich musical traditions.

Nashville's thriving music scene has also attracted another festival called Bonaroo—a 4-day event that brings more than 75,000 music lovers to Manchester, TN. The event showcases a wide variety of music including rock, jazz and bluegrass.

This year, more than 80 bands participated, including: the Allman Broth-

ers; Dave Matthews; and Alison Krauss. In just 4 years, Bonaroo has become America's premier rock festival.

Tennessee is truly a musical mecca. And it has launched some of the biggest careers in music history, including: Elvis Presley; Hank Williams; Johnny Cash; Loretta Lynn; B.B. King; and Garth Brooks, one of the biggest selling popular music artists of all time.

I'm proud and blessed to be from this extraordinary place. And I am proud to be from Nashville, "Music City USA."

#### OBSTRUCTIONISTS

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, on Tuesday—for the record, today is Thursday—President Bush gave a speech in which he complained that Democrats are obstructionists because we are not accepting his entire agenda.

The President also said that we say no to everything. I listened to him and I watched him on TV. But look at all the things he says no to. President Bush said no to Tony Blair when the Prime Minister was here to ask for more help for Africa, to help with AIDS, hunger, and loan reduction. He said no.

President Bush says no to kids with juvenile diabetes, autism, or other childhood diseases, when they ask to be permitted to do stem cell research to see if we can prevent those diseases from plaguing these youngsters for life.

President Bush said no to parents and teachers who want education fully funded.

President Bush said no to a real Patients' Bill of Rights.

President Bush said no to making polluters pay for Superfund environmental cleanups, a program that has been very successful. I was author of the second iteration of Superfund in 1986. It was a program that needed some time to get going. But now we can look at lots of sites that have been cleaned up and are put to useful purposes that don't threaten children or families who live in the area. President Bush said no to making the polluters pay. He said yes to making the taxpayers pay for the cleanup problems the polluters created.

President Bush said no to getting tough with the Saudi Arabians, so we can really bring down oil prices. The Saudis said no to us when we asked for help in keeping oil prices down. Look what has happened to oil prices. I remember so vividly in the last Presidential campaign, when Senator KERRY challenged President Bush. The thing that came out of the White House—the statement most clearly was: If Senator KERRY becomes President, you are going to see taxes on oil prices. If you want to see taxes on oil prices, just look at what happened. The only difference is these taxes are being paid to Saudi Arabia and other places that are not friendly to the United States. But the public is paying for it. Gasoline has gone from \$1.20 to, in some places,

\$2.50, which I paid recently. I don't hear the President saying no to them when they call and say they want help from us.

And the President calls us the obstructionists? I find that label very interesting. What it means is, if you oppose any of President Bush's policies, you are an obstructionist. Frankly, in a democratic Nation, that is unacceptable. It is a disastrous line of thinking. In my view, if you don't like challenge, then you don't understand democracy. This is not a nation where we have a dictator. There should not be a time when simply because the President of the United States thinks it is a good idea that we avoid debate or challenge that we should. No, not on your life. That is how we get ideas and how we challenge the public in this country to say something about the programs in which we are engaged.

The President says: If you don't like my programs, then you are an obstructionist.

Tell that to the people whose pensions are fading in front of their eyes. Tell that to the people who work 25, 30 years for a company and see their jobs ended, without the prospect of coming anywhere near the salary they were earning. No, he doesn't say no to the people he ought to say no to. The President proposed the other day—yesterday—that the tax rate that has done us so much good is something he wants to make permanent—I wish he would say no to that—so that the wealthiest among us don't go ahead and wait for their airplanes to be delivered after 3 years. If you order a private airplane—a \$25 million or \$30 million airplane—if you want to buy one, sorry, there is a line. If you want large yachts, 100 to 200 feet, you have to wait 2 years. What a pity it is for those rich guys to have to pay their share of taxes. I am one of those who have been so fortunate in America. I created a business that got to be very big, along with two other friends who grew up in the poor neighborhood in which I lived. I am more than willing to pay more taxes because, if I do that, I have more money left.

I wish the President of the United States would say no to those people and yes to the people struggling to make a living; yes to the kids who cannot afford to pay for college tuition; yes to those people and don't accuse the Democrats of being obstructionists. Saddam Hussein didn't have to worry about obstructionists in his country. He killed them or jailed them. Mr. President, leaders who are free of obstructionists are also known as dictators.

Our constituents elected us to represent them and their viewpoints in the Senate. One thing I knew when I came to this Senate—now over 20 years ago—I wasn't elected by all the Republicans, by a long shot. I am not even sure I was elected by all of the Democrats. But I won. When I stood and took my oath, I never thought once

that I don't have to pay attention to those who did not vote for me—the Republicans, typically. When I won this seat and the responsibility, I accepted the responsibility, and I had an obligation to every citizen in my State and the citizens of this country to listen to them and try to understand their needs. That is what you get in a democracy. You get the opportunity to represent all of the people. It is not just the rubberstamp of the President's initiatives. The Constitution created the Senate as a check on Presidential power. The Founding Fathers created the Senate in order to obstruct the President, when necessary.

Mr. President, throughout history, so-called obstructionists have been the champions of democracy. Looking at these photos of people like this who resisted tyranny, are they obstructionists? Are the people who stood up against tyranny in so many other countries obstructionists? Are they people who are fighting for a cause, or are they obstructionists? This picture looks like Boston. Can those people be called obstructionists as they tried to defend their land? I don't think so. If we look further, there were people who disagreed with some of the Founding Fathers' views, who obstructed the King of England with our Declaration of Independence. It was a pretty good idea, one would have to assume. There was another time when an obstructionist stood up with incredible courage; her name was Rosa Parks. She obstructed immoral rules in her State, and in the picture you see her being fingerprinted before she goes to jail. Obstructionist? There was a former Republican Senator, Margaret Chase Smith. She spoke so eloquently in 1950 in the Senate in order to obstruct the tactics of Senator Joe McCarthy, with his bullying, sadistic kind of approach. Is that an obstructionist or is that a heroine? Women fought for the right to vote. The young women who are here tonight cannot think about times like that. Imagine a woman not being allowed to vote. Were they obstructionists?

Mr. President, the signs in the picture say, "How long must women wait for liberty?" And "Mr. President, what will you do for woman suffrage, for the right to vote?" Yes, they obstructed immorality.

So obstructionism, per se, is not an evil force if you are on the side of the people.

I say here today, in light of our democracy's heritage of productive obstructionism, I will be proud to obstruct some of President Bush's proposals this year.

I am happy to obstruct the President's plan to privatize Social Security and throw our retirement security into the stock market. I will be happy to obstruct those. If people want to take a chance, if they want to gamble, they should go to Atlantic City or Las Vegas, but do not do it with your pension because when you need it, it is liable not to be there.

A few months ago the President presented an unrealistic and flawed budget to Congress, and I hope to obstruct many items in the President's misguided budget proposal. For example, I hope to obstruct President Bush's plan to cut Medicaid by \$60 billion over 10 years. Cuts that hurt the poor and the elderly, our Nation's most vulnerable populations. They need that help for their health and for their families. I am not going to stand by and not obstruct those cuts.

President Bush wants to take health care away from lower income families and lower income senior citizens. Is there any compassion there? I do not think so.

If we look at Amtrak, the Nation's premier rail service, the President wants to leave it without money, zero fund Amtrak, shut down the system. You better believe I am going to be there to obstruct that plan whenever I can. Shut down the system that took 25 million riders to their destinations last year?

The President also wants to slash community development programs. He proposes cutting funding to these programs by more than a third. Nearly \$4 billion will be taken out of communities across the country. I want to obstruct that.

In regard to protecting our homeland, President Bush has proposed reducing homeland security block grants, cutting them by \$253 million. America's soil, America's land, it is a second front in this war against terrorism, and our soldiers are paying a price for their fight there, a terrible price, because the President said no to having enough soldiers to do that job right from the beginning. There are great generals who now reflect on the mission and say: We could have used more soldiers there. One very senior general got fired for suggesting we need over 300,000 troops there.

The President said no to them, but he should not say no to having homeland security financed sufficiently to protect our citizens when they go to work, go to school, go to the library, or travel about our country. I hope everyone in this Chamber will obstruct that cut. I would like my colleagues to say no to that.

On the issue of airline travel, President Bush wants to increase the airline passenger tax by \$3 for each leg of a flight. A family of four traveling with a layover each way could see their taxes increase by up to \$64 for their round trip.

People are already paying too much in airline passenger taxes. I will obstruct, yes, obstruct President Bush's tax increase.

On our environment, President Bush's budget cuts environmental and natural resource programs by \$2 billion. With child asthma cases increasing and other environmental dangers increasing across the country, why would we reduce environmental protection?

I have a grandson who is 11, and he happens to have asthma. He is the oldest of my 10 grandchildren. He is a very good athlete. But whenever my daughter takes him to compete in a baseball game or a soccer game, she always checks where the nearest emergency clinic is in case he has an asthma attack. Childhood asthma is growing in this country by leaps and bounds, and it is because the air is bad and we are not doing enough to clean it up. Asthma and other environmental dangers are increasing across the country. Why would President Bush say no to environmental protection? President Bush, I do not know why you want to obstruct funding for those programs.

Obstructionism is all that separates democracy from dictatorship. Sometimes obstruction is necessary, and in the case of President Bush's agenda, it deserves a healthy amount of obstruction. I hope my colleagues on this floor, regardless of party, will look at each of the President's programs and say: Remember that President Bush obstructed funding for teaching, for schools, for stem cell research, for research on Parkinson's or Alzheimer's. Remember, he obstructed funding for those programs. He took care of the rich, who are only getting richer.

If you looked in the New York Times about 2 weeks ago, there was an article about how the richest in this country are leaving the rich behind, about how 90 percent of the people in this country who work to keep their families together own only 10 percent of the assets of the country, and it is just the reverse on the top side.

In the case of President Bush's agenda, it deserves a healthy amount of obstruction, and I hope the people in this Chamber have the courage to stand up and say: No, I obstruct those terrible cuts and that mean, unhelpful disposition to make it tougher for hard-working families in this country to be able to support themselves, their children, and their needs.

#### BOLTON NOMINATION

Mr. DODD. Madam President, last evening, something rather extraordinary happened here in the waning minutes of the session. My very good friend from Kansas, the distinguished chairman of the Intelligence Committee, took the floor to discuss the Bolton nomination—an issue, I say to my colleagues, no one wants to be resolved more quickly than the Senator from Connecticut. I have been involved in this for two straight months. The Presiding Officer and I are both on the Committee on Foreign Relations. This goes back to April 11, the day we had hearings. My hope is that we can resolve this matter sooner rather than later.

Last night, my friend from Kansas took the floor and announced that he knew what names the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee were concerned about when dealing